

FORT MONMOUTH ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION PLANNING AUTHORITY

SOCIAL SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SSAC)

REPORT ON PUBLIC MEETING, October 30, 2007

The FMERPA Social Services Advisory Committee (SSAC) public meeting took place on October 30, 2007 at 3:00 p.m. at the FMERPA office located at 2-12 Corbett Way, Eatontown, N.J.

In attendance were Committee Members: Rose Estephan, Rick Harrison, Lynn Miller, and Ana Dowland. FMERPA Staff Member: Diane Canterbury. Public in attendance: Tom Mahedy, Philip Welch, John Yaecker, and Scott Snyder. Committee Members not in attendance: Joe Colfer, Laurie Cannon, and Russell Valenti.

1. Open/Welcome/Introductions - Rose Estephan - Rose welcomed everyone and acknowledged the public in attendance and told them that their input is welcome, although the intent of the committee was to adhere to the agenda in order to accomplish the efforts of the committee.

2. Review of Evaluation Process and Meeting Process - Rick Harrison - Rick provided a synopsis of the evaluation process explaining the BRAC law, HUD's role. Rick also indicated that the FMERPA Staff and the BRAC Attorney will be evaluating the capabilities and financial data provided by the NOI Submitters. He informed the attendees that detailed direction and requirements for the next phase of the evaluation will be provided to the NOI Submitters.

**Public Input:** Tom Mahedy questioned the criteria for the evaluation being done. Rick Harrison and Rose indicated that each submitter is aware of the criteria and have been contacted directly should there have been a need for clarification.

3. Review of Prior Meeting Notes - Rose Estephan - Rose provided attendees with a copy of the report and asked for input. Scott Snyder indicated that he was not listed as an attendee. The error was noted.

4. Review of NOI Submitter correspondence re: categorization - Diane Canterbury - Diane questioned the committee Chair if it was appropriate to provide all attendees with categorization findings. The response from the Chair was to confirm with the BRAC attorney first. Should they approve; the categorization table would be provided to all attendees. Diane proceeded to provide a synopsis of the responses received from the 17Oct07 letter to NOI Submitters. The 17Oct07 letter requested confirmation of the categorized data of each submitter's NOI. There were eight out of fourteen responses received. Any modifications were boldly highlighted and provided to the Advisory Committee members. Diane will be contacting the non-respondent NOI Submitters directly to obtain their input being that a non response does not indicate concurrence.

**Public Input:** Tom Mahedy stated that he would like to have a copy of the categorized table. Rose informed him that he and others can have upon attorney approval. Scott Snyder indicated that he did not need to have the categorized table to move forward with the agenda.

5. Match County Consolidated Plan needs and priorities to NOI Submitters - All. This agenda item was tabled for the next scheduled meeting of this Advisory Committee. The charts for the data that would have been used as a guide were not readily available, it was also suggested that the Monmouth County subject matter expert be present for this discussion. This subject matter expert would add value by providing expertise, guidance, and answering questions the committee may have. The original intent for this agenda item was to use the Monmouth Consolidated Plan as a guide (Rick stated that he will post a link to the document on the FMERPA web page). An open discussion took place where it was apparent that additional expertise was required. Discussion of filling gaps vs. adding to the population also took place.

6. Discuss SSAC Homeless Provider Visits - Rose Estephan, Ana Dowland. Rose discussed the visits to Homes for All and The Center explaining the importance of the visits. She indicated that she was impressed with the facilities and asked all visitors to share their input. Ana Dowland was equally impressed with the facilities and noted how their service was well managed. Diane Canterbury shared that she too was impressed and that the two facilities could not be compared based on the services provided were for different sub-populations. The Homes for All looked and felt like any community that one would ride through. It was not apparent that it was affordable housing. The Center in Asbury Park was well managed, served a great purpose, security was tight and overall a facility worth its purpose. Rick Harrison pointed out that he shared the comments previously expressed but pointed out that there was no Homeless component to the Homes For All facility but there were 40 units designated as Section 8. He also noted that the Center accepts clients from both Ocean and Monmouth Counties; however, the majority comes from Monmouth County.

7. Discuss pending SSAC Homeless Provider Visits and Schedule - Committee Members Ana Dowling, Lynn Miller, Rick Harrison and FMERPA Staff Member Diane Canterbury were scheduled to visit Family Promise (previously known as Interfaith Hospitality Network of Monmouth County) and HABCore, Incorporated on 31Oct07. Discussion of those visits will take place at the next scheduled Advisory Committee meeting. Rose Estephan indicated that she could not attend the visits on 31Oct07 although, requested that, upon availability of FMERPA staff (Rick and/or Diane) she would like to visit those organizations. Rick replied that he will set it up and that a FMERPA staff member will join her on those visits. Rick is still firming up dates for visits to Easter Seals, Vetgroup, Affordable Housing Alliance, and Ocean Inc.; based on schedules he is tentatively working towards 07 & 11 Dec07 for those visits.

8. Schedule Next Meeting - The next meeting is scheduled for 11Dec07 at 3:00 p.m. at the FMERPA office located in Eatontown, NJ. This is due to the Thanksgiving holiday and site visits that committee members are attending.

**Public Input:** Tom Mahedy had the following comments (*may not be in order presented*): 1) suggested that the committee be more prepared for the meetings; that there was too much shuffling of paper and copies being made during the meeting, 2) not all members of the committee were in attendance; this was an ongoing situation where the commitments of un-attending members were questionable, 3) The gas at Howard Commons were turned off and he wasn't sure if FMERPA was looking into. Phil Welch suggested that Tom bring this to the attention of Mayor Tarantola, being that he was fully aware of all the details leading to the action.

Rose stated that this issue was brought up numerous times before, including at the monthly Board meetings and that it was a closed matter, 4) questioned how PBCs could be rejected without explanations. Rick responded by, once again, giving the description of the process of approval/rejection in accordance with BRAC law. This includes the fact that the various Advisory Committees will evaluate all of the PBC NOIs and provide recommendations to the master planner for input to the plan. Once included in the plan, PBC NOIs candidates would be recommended to the FMERPA Board for their approval. The final approval resides with the Federal Sponsors who would pursue the PBC with the Department of Defense for conveyance. 5) the point in time numbers for counting homeless are inaccurate, HUD makes it difficult for the county to provide accurate count, and that the day (winter) is not a time to do such a count. Lynn Miller responded that his statements were false and they have over seventy-five people going out to do an accurate site count for the point in time survey who cover as many places and people that they know of and are made aware of. In addition data is gathered from the homeless management information system and from all agencies having homeless persons in emergency assistance placement on that day. Staff and volunteers from the non profit agencies do an exceptional job in gathering data for the point in time survey. The date for the survey is determined on a nationwide basis by USHUD. The tabulation of data is done by USHUD. The county is proactive in this matter and stated that HUD mandates this survey be done bi-yearly; the county has chosen in the past to do the survey yearly. Rose indicated that she takes offense in him making these statements time and time again without knowing all the facts. Tom stated it was from past experience within Monmouth County.